

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These Remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed December 1, 2005 ("Office Action"). Claims 5, 13 and 21 have been canceled. Claims 1, 6, 14, and 24 have been amended to clarify various embodiments of the present invention. Support for the amendments can be found on at least pages 31-33 and Figure 6 of the instant application as originally filed. No new matter has been entered. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-25 for at least the following reasons.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Commonwealth of Virginia Information Technology Resource Management Guideline, hereinafter ITRM. For at least the reasons detailed below, Applicants respectfully disagree. Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite "*presenting information regarding the status of the project, including a vertical graphic indicating a level of completion for each principal step and further presenting a horizontal graphic indicating a level of completion with respect to the overall process involving each of the principal steps and further presenting one or more tollgate graphics for one or more principal steps that require an approval procedure.*" Independent claim 6 has been amended to include "*presenting information regarding the status of the project, including a vertical graphic indicating a level of completion for each principal step and further presenting a horizontal graphic indicating a level of completion with respect to the overall process involving each of the principal steps and further presenting one or more tollgate graphics for one or more principal steps that require an approval procedure.*" In addition, the

claims have been amended to clarify that the steps are performed as a “computer implemented method.” The ITRM reference fails to disclose at least these limitations.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Patent Office bears the burden of presenting at least a prima facie case of anticipation. Anticipation requires that a prior art reference disclose, either expressly or under the principles of inherency, each and every element of the claimed invention. In addition, the prior art reference must sufficiently describe the claimed invention so as to have placed the public in possession of it. In this case, as discussed in detail above, the Office Action has failed to show that the ITRM reference discloses each and every claim limitation recited by Applicants. Therefore, the Office Action has failed to meet its burden. The rejection of claims 1-10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn and the claims allowed accordingly.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11, 12, and 14-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Commonwealth of Virginia Information Technology Resource Management Guideline, hereinafter ITRM.

Independent claim 14 has been amended to recite “*wherein the database access device comprises an output device configured to present information regarding the status of the project, including a vertical graphic indicating a level of completion for each principal step and further including a horizontal graphic indicating a level of completion with respect to the overall process involving each of the principal steps and further presenting one or more tollgate graphics for one or more principal steps that require an approval procedure.*” Independent claim 24 has been amended to recite “*wherein the database access device includes an output device configured to present information regarding the status of the structured process,*

including a vertical graphic indicating a level of completion for each principal step and further presenting a horizontal graphic indicating a level of completion with respect to the overall process involving each of the principal steps and further including one or more tollgate graphics for one or more principal steps that require an approval procedure.” In addition, the claims have been amended to clarify that the system is a “computer implemented system.” At least these limitations are not disclosed in ITRM reference. Further, there is nothing to suggest modifying the ITRM reference to include these missing limitations.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that prosecution and allowance of the application will be expedited through an interview, whether personal or telephonic, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with any suggestions leading to the favorable disposition of the application.

It is believed that no fees are due for filing this Response. However, the Director is hereby authorized to treat any current or future reply, requiring a petition for an extension of time for its timely submission as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time. Applicants also authorize the Director to charge all required fees, fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.17, or all required extension of time fees, to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

By:



Yisun Song
Registration No 44,487

Dated: March 31, 2006

Hunton & Williams LLP
Intellectual Property Department
1900 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)